



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,538	12/19/2003	David A. Petersen	2003P14535US	4649
7590 Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830				
EXAMINER				
CHENG, JACQUELINE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3777				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/741,538

Applicant(s)

PETERSEN ET AL.

Examiner

JACQUELINE CHENG

Art Unit

3768

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 9-12 and 14-24.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Tse Chen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3777

/Jacqueline Cheng/
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments that Hunt (US 2003/0139664 A1) does not teach converting in a connector housing releasable from the ultrasound system, a cable connecting the transducer probe housing with the connector housing as claimed in claim 1. As stated in the response to arguments dated July 6, 2010 the examiner is interpreting the housing holding the ultrasonic processor 38 as the ultrasound system. This can be separate from the transducer 18 as stated in paragraph 0022, which, as the applicants representative stated, is silent about the additional circuitry being separated. Paragraph 0028 fills this gap, further disclosing that the transducer 18 can also be separated from the additional circuitry which would result in three separate housings. Furthermore paragraph 0042 discusses having a second housing 40 separate from the housing 16, and separate from the ultrasound processor 38 which would be in a third housing showing that three housing embodiments are taught by Hunt. In particular although fig. 7 does not show a cord between the housings and the processor it is obvious as stated in Hunt that wireless connections can be replaced by corded connections and it is obvious that corded connections can be releasable therefore in such a configuration, fig. 7 would have a connector housing 40 within which conversions can be done and which can be releasably connected to the ultrasound system 38 (with a wired connection replacing the wireless connection shown). Fig. 7 also would have a cable 42 connecting the transducer probe housing 16 with the connector housing 40. As to claim 9, again it is obvious for the cables connected to the connector housing to be releasable mixed with paragraph 0031 disclosing that the transducer can have a partial beamformer which would leave the connector housing with the rest of the signal processing device of the other half of the partial receive beamformer (paragraph 0024 further discloses that the receive beamformers, which in this embodiment would be the partial receive beamformers, can have their own housings), fulfills the claim limitations of claim 9. It is therefore still believed that Hunt alone or in view of Erikson (US 6,752,763) as previously discussed still stands.

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendment as submitted would overcome the objection to claim 1.